

Open Architecture CRs 2007-01

CR Number: 4837
External Reference: CR 4836; SAFER CR 536
Category: New XML Web Services Transaction
Component: SAFER/CVISN
Synopsis: Request for new XML transaction to provide near real-time OOSO changes to PRISM and CVISN users.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-01-19] - Open pending review and discussion.
Description: [2007-01-17] Salazar (from SAFER CR 536)

Architecture CR 4836/SAFER CR 536 proposes changes to MCMIS and SAFER to make OOSO changes available to users via SAFER in near real-time. That proposal involves creating a new trigger in MCMIS that would notify SAFER when a change is made to the out of service status of a carrier by submitting a job into an asynchronous queue maintained within Oracle. The job would contain information that would be inserted into a new table within SAFER indicating that a change had been made in MCMIS since the last daily MCMIS to SAFER update routine.

To minimize the impact on SAFER, the carrier table in SAFER would not be updated as a result of the change in MCMIS. Instead, the job submitted by the MCMIS trigger would load the USDOT Number into a table created in SAFER that contains the USDOT number, MCSIP Step and a timestamp field. A trigger in SAFER would then retrieve the carrier's MCSIP Step from MCMIS and update the current timestamp.

This CR requests that this information be made available via a new SAFER Web Services transaction. That transaction would check to see if a change had been made to the out of service status of a carrier since the last daily MCMIS update to SAFER and, if so, it would use the resulting MCSIP Step value when returning carrier census data to the user. If a change had not been made, all field values would come from the SAFER carrier table.

While these changes were originally proposed to support PRISM users, this real-time information would also be useful to roadside enforcement.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting. Gary DeRusha (Volpe) explained SAFER CR 536 and noted that the PRISM program is embracing Web services technology. It was noted that the corresponding ECCB RFC has been approved. The SAFER part is on a schedule for development this year, but a MCMIS commitment is still needed. Doug Deckert (WA) noted that this near real-time OOSO change information will be useful to CVISN roadside enforcement as well as to PRISM users.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time: 1/19/2007 12:25:13 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 1/17/2007 10:33:53 AM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 4836
External Reference: SAFER CR 536
Category: MCMIS Update of OOSO activity to SAFER in Near Real-Time
Component: SAFER/MCMIS
Synopsis: Request for OOSO change to be made available to SAFER in near real-time.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-01-19] - Open pending review and discussion.
Description: [2007-01-17] Salazar (from SAFER CR 536)

The FMCSA PRISM program utilizes the SAFER database to provide its users with MCMIS carrier census data necessary to comply with several PRISM program requirements. States maintain a local version of this data by processing a batch file after SAFER has been updated with a daily MCMIS activity transaction file. Due to timing delays inherent with these batch file updates, PRISM implementation procedures require that users verify the out of service status maintained in MCMIS if during processing the carrier disputes the value of the data maintained locally. Recently, PRISM has suggested that States utilize existing SAFER Web Services as an alternative to using their local systems to access the value of certain carrier census data. However, this approach only addresses the timing and logistical problems associated with getting the daily transaction batch files from SAFER to the State users. When necessary, on-line web browser access to MCMIS to validate data values is still required due to the timing differences between what is in SAFER and the actual value maintained in MCMIS.

To help resolve this problem, PRISM requests that a trigger be built in MCMIS to monitor the OOS_Carrier table that is updated whenever an out of service order is issued or rescinded. The only function of this trigger would be to notify SAFER in real time when a carrier has a change made to its Out of Service Status. The notification would be done by initiating a request to the Oracle Database Management System job queue that would in turn pass that USDOT Number to SAFER using an existing database link. A trigger in SAFER would then retrieve the carrier's MCSIP Step from MCMIS using an indexed key search through that same database link. Together these enhancements should go unnoticed by end users but they would allow subsequent inquiries using a new SAFER web services transaction to return the latest out of service status of the carrier in near real-time mode. The PRISM team will work with SAFER to specify the contents of this new transaction separately.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.
Gary DeRusha (Volpe) explained SAFER CR 536 and noted that the PRISM program is embracing Web services technology. It was noted that the corresponding ECCB RFC has been approved. The SAFER part is on a schedule for development this year, but a MCMIS commitment is still needed. Doug Deckert (WA) noted that this near real-time OOSO change information will be useful to CVISN roadside enforcement as well as to PRISM users.

Fix:

Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B
Modified Time: 1/19/2007 12:25:57 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 1/17/2007 10:19:08 AM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 4795
External Reference: SAFER CR 1429
Category: XML subscription enhancement
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: States request a capability for a state to select to receive the most recent record or all records for a given VIN, via the subscription process.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2007-01-18] Open, 30-day review.
Description: Background:
The SAFER subscription capability allows states to filter on certain fields, thus restricting the data that they receive. Subscription service currently exists for T0028 V2 (IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction) and T0031 (MCMIS Safety & Census Update Output Transaction).

With the SAFER 5.1 Release, the SAFER VIN table has been restructured to prevent data from being overwritten. This means the SAFER database may contain multiple records for the same VIN.

Change Request:

At the November 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that a filter be implemented for all output transactions to give states the option of receiving only the most recent registration record for a given VIN or all registration records for a given VIN. This will support SAFER CRs 50 and 1386 (Architecture CRs 2562 "Request to review SAFER business rule regarding multiple VINs" and 4788 "Transfer of Vehicle License Plate"). (NOTE: Architecture CR 2562/SAFER CR 1386 was disapproved 2006-12.)

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.

States on the call supported recommending for FMCSA approval. Will be posted to the listserv for 30-day review.

[2007-01-18] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.

The discussion centered on the meaning of "most recent record" and on why a state would want this capability. Gary DeRusha noted that this CR was meant to grandfather the current behavior,

i.e., provide that a state may choose to receive only one registration record for a given VIN and state. However, since the SAFER VIN table has been restructured (SAFER Release 5.1), records are not overwritten, and it is possible for more than one registration record to exist for a given VIN and state. This CR was intended to address multiple registration records for a given VIN within a state.

It was proposed that the REGISTRATION_START_DATE in the SAFER VIN table be the field that determines the “most recent record”. It was also proposed that a state be able to filter on any one of the following options:

- a. Retrieve the most recent record for which STATUS = “Active”
- b. Retrieve the most recent record regardless of STATUS value
- c. Retrieve the most recent record for which STATUS = “Active”, but if no such record exists, then retrieve the most recent record for which STATUS = “Inactive”

APL and Volpe will reword the CR and repost to the listserv for another 30-day comment period.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 1/19/2007 12:28:31 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 12/8/2006 1:31:11 PM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4789
External Reference: SAFER CR 1387
Category: SAFER
Component:
Synopsis: Implement capability to process Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) information
Status: Open
Disposition: [2006-11-21] Open pending further analysis and discussion.
Description: Summary:
Unified Carrier Registration (UCR) is being established to replace the Single State Registration System (SSRS). The FMCSA program office has committed to the UCR board to provide a capability to store the states’ UCR registration fee into a centralized application and to display the UCR registration status to the roadside. The current recommendation is to leverage SAFER’s architecture to store the UCR information and display to the roadside via Query Central and ISS. According to the requirement, SAFER needs to implement an input transaction using web service technology to process the UCR data uploaded from states and store it in the SAFER database.

Volpe will need to provide interface control documentation and to implement a certification process with states' UCR systems.

The next step will be for the staff to discuss requirements with the UCR board. This is expected to happen before the end of November 2006. It has not yet been determined whether this change would involve a change to an existing XML transaction or creation of a new transaction type.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.

Volpe reported on a meeting that was held by FMCSA in the first week of December. An extension on deploying the UCR capability was not granted. Texas has volunteered to deploy a state UCR system that will be made available for other states to use. Eventually there will be one centralized system. Volpe is finalizing the requirements and beginning the design for changes to SAFER. There will be a two-phase implementation.

- Phase 1: By January, SAFER will have a component ready for testing with a state UCR system. Volpe will publish the XML schema and interface documentation.

- Phase 2: By February-March timeframe, the Federal applications (Query Central, ISS, and MCMIS) will have the functionality to pull the UCR information from SAFER.

States are waiting for the UCR Board to tell them what the fees and the application are for UCR. There will not be a UCR credential; the only way to check will be electronically.

[2007-01-19] Discussed at the 1/18/07 ACCB meeting.

Jingfei Wu (Volpe) noted that the implementation of the SAFER capability to upload UCR data from a state system is ahead of schedule and waiting for a Texas team to have a state system ready for beta testing. The draft high-level system specification has been posted to the ACCB Collaboration site for states to reference.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 1/19/2007 12:27:24 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 11/21/2006 11:46:17 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Adaptive Change
Closed On:

CR Number: 4777
External Reference: WA; SAFER CR 1508
Category: Request for summary reports
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: Request for summary data reports that can be used by states to do a quick check of their CVIEW data quality.

Status: Recommended
Disposition: [2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval.
Description: Summary data can be used by states to do a quick check of their CVIEW data quality. It also provides a way to track growth of the various types of data (vehicles, fleets, IFTA accounts, Carriers, etc.) in SAFER.

Following are suggested monthly reports, tabulated by state:

1. total carriers, carrier updates for month
2. total IRP accounts, active IRP accounts, IRP account updates for month
3. total fleets, active fleets, fleet updates for month
4. total vehicles, active vehicles, vehicles updates for month
5. total IFTA accounts, active IFTA accounts, IFTA account updates for month

If possible the states would like to be able to specify the time frame for the monthly summary report to allow synchronization of the report with our local processing cycle. If not, there should at least be an established cut off date each month so that states will be able to determine which of their transactions should or should not be included in the report. [WA 2006-10-20 comment]

[2006-10-19] Presented at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting

[2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval at the 11/16 ACCB meeting.

[2007-01-15] Volpe: The SAFER development team will need to further clarify the above requirements with the stakeholders. For example, when it says 'updates for the month', does that mean the total count of updates for that transaction SAFER received?

The suggested reports are doable and should be a good way for tracking the growth of the data.

Not sure about how that would help the data quality checking unless other data elements are included in the report template.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 1/16/2007 12:01:49 PM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 10/12/2006 6:50:10 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4776
External WA; SAFER CR 1507

Reference:

Category: SAFER Upload Change Tracking

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: A SAFER Web page and/or Web service query capability is needed that will allow a state to retrieve all XML transaction data for a vehicle, fleet, or other uploaded entity that is uploaded by a state using a T0019, 20, 21, 22 or 24 transaction.

Status: Recommended

Disposition: [2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

Description: SAFER Upload Change Tracking: A SAFER Web page and/or Web service query capability is needed that will allow a state to retrieve all XML transaction data for a vehicle (VIN), fleet or other uploaded entity that is uploaded by a state using a T0019, 20, 21, 22 or 24 transaction.

This is a SAFER data integrity related enhancement. The primary purpose of this enhancement is to aid with troubleshooting of problems where a state is not receiving data from another state or a state's data is not appearing in SAFER.

The queried information needs to include the XML upload file name and time stamp for each XML file where matching data is found.

The process used to extract the XML data must use "relaxed" versions of the XSD's for the above transactions so that no fields are required. The intent here would be to capture as much data as possible from the incoming XML files so that that even XML transactions that are rejected by SAFER would be logged in the tracking database (as much is practical).

14 months worth of data should be kept so we can find the data for the last vehicle renewal for a vehicle.

The primary key fields for each transaction type would be the key fields used to perform a query. The only exceptions to this would be: 1) T0022 transaction – allow query by VIN or LICENSE_PLATE_NUMBER and 2) T0024 transaction – allow query by VIN or TRANSPONDER_ID.

[2006-10-19] Presented at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.

While several states supported implementation of this capability, others questioned why Volpe's monitoring is not adequate. Volpe noted that this capability would enable states to do their own analysis, as sometimes the reason for an upload failure is related to states' business rules. It was agreed that this CR would be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for further comment.

[2006-11-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval at the 11/16 ACCB meeting.

[2007-01-15] Volpe. To fulfill this request, a SAFER query function needs to be implemented and the information will be displayed via the SAFER web page. The preliminary requirements from the ACCB are listed below:

1. The record should contain the XML upload file name with corresponding upload date.
2. Use "relaxed" versions of the schemas that the input transactions are using
3. Track all input transaction file names including the ones that failed. This implies the processing status should be one of the data element as well.
4. Tracking scope consists of 14 months worth of data to cover the last renewal information for a vehicle.
5. The searching parameters for each transaction would be limited to the key fields in each transaction.

The SAFER team will need to clarify the above requirements further with the stakeholders before designing such capability.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 1/16/2007 11:57:30 AM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 10/12/2006 6:49:06 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4727
External Reference: SAFER CR 960
Category: Intrastate SafeStat data
Component: SAFER/Web Services
Synopsis: Synopsis: SAFER needs to be enhanced to handle Intrastate SafeStat data.

Summary: SAFER needs to be enhanced to receive the intrastate SafeStat score from A&I and store in newly added columns in SAFER database. The ISS snapshot Web services maintained by SAFER will be modified to include the intrastate SafeStat score.

Status: Recommended
Disposition: [2006-07-26]Recommended for FMCSA ECCB approval
Description: The ISS development team requested to include intrastate SafeStat data into ISS to support the single carrier refresh snapshot and monthly database refresh.

SAFER needs to be enhanced to receive the intrastate SafeStat score from A&I and store in newly added columns in SAFER database. The ISS snapshot Web services maintained by SAFER will be modified to include the intrastate SafeStat score. It was determined that the intrastate SafeStat score currently is stored in MCMIS work tables and is being updated after each regular SafeStat run.

ISS development team will need to modify the monthly database refresh routine to receive the intrastate SafeStat score.

The SAFER team will need to develop a script to extract data via database link to MCMIS and load into the SAFER database.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.

Intrastate ISS values are calculated monthly with the SafeStat runs, but are not currently posted in MCMIS production or to SAFER. Currently, these intrastate carriers have their ISS values listed in SAFER as "Insufficient Data" (when, in fact, they could have many inspections). This proposal would begin to populate the intrastate SafeStat and ISS values to SAFER and include an

additional indicator to indicate that these values are based on the intrastate SafeStat results. This will involve a change to the T0031 MCMIS Census and Safety output transaction. The current proposed change will add the value "N" to the list of possible values for the Indicator field.

[2006-08-16] From SAFER Version of the CR

From Allen Day:

Here are the table names and logic to determine intra-state ISS and SafeStat values from work tables on MCMIS. These work tables are available after the SafeStat run has been validated until the next SafeStat run validation process begins.

Intra-State ISS

Table: iss_work

safestat_run_ind = 'S' (intra state SafeStat) iss_group 1-46 Safety Based ISS Values iss_group 98-99 Insufficient Data ISS Values

Intra-State SafeStat

Table: SafeStat_Information

safestat_run_ind = 'S' (intra state SafeStat) safestat_category 'A', 'B','C','D','E','F','G','H' (Safety Based/Sufficient Data) safestat_category = 'T' (insufficient data/no safestat scores)

If you need more detailed information on SafeStat Indicators (RAI, EHI, AII,etc.) you can use the following join information to get the desired information:

```
FROM safestat_information a, ss_info_census b, ss_info_review c, ss_info_inspection d,
ss_info_recordable_crash e, ss_info_enforcement f, ss_info_crash g
WHERE a.safestat_information_id (+) = b.safestat_information_id and
b.safestat_information_id = c.safestat_information_id (+) and
b.safestat_information_id = d.safestat_information_id (+) and
b.safestat_information_id = e.safestat_information_id (+) and
b.safestat_information_id = f.safestat_information_id (+) and
b.safestat_information_id = g.safestat_information_id (+) and
a.safestat_score_date= 'safestat_run_date' and
safestat_run_ind = 'safestat_run_indicator' ('M'onthly run, intra'S'tate SafeStat)
```

[2006-10-19] Status reported at 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.

Implementation was deferred from SAFER 5.1 but is on the list for FY07.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 10/19/2006 6:57:50 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 7/19/2006 1:18:07 PM

Entered By: Roberts Onna Beth

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 4674
External Reference: SAFER CR 797
Category: Data integrity
Component: SAFER
Synopsis: Modification to data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER
Status: Recommended
Disposition: [2006-10-19] Recommended for FMCSA ECCB Approval
Description: * PLEASE SEE [2006-08-14] ENTRY BELOW FOR UPDATED DESCRIPTION
* PLEASE SEE [2006-10-17] ENTRY BELOW FOR UPDATE TO THAT ONE

PRISM stakeholder requested to re-visit the data requirement for safety_carrier. After SAFER version 4.9, safety_carrier becomes a conditional mandatory field in T0022 transaction. That requires CVISN/PRISM states to populate safety_carrier data field for all vehicle uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN-only states. The proposed modification is when the IRP_Weight_Carried is under 6,000 lbs or to be determined, the carrier responsible for safety of the vehicle doesn't required to have DOT number. Therefore, the safety_carrier field does not need to be filled.

[2006-05-26] Presented and discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.
NE stated that there are two weight related issues with IRP_WEIGHT_CARRIED. The weight limit is 10,000 lbs. by FMCSA Rules. If the weight is under 10,000 lbs, a Carrier ID (Safety Carrier) is not required. This CR is asking to relax the constraint for CVISN/PRISM states regarding the mandatory data requirement to populate the Safety Carrier field. The Carrier ID is not required if under 10,000 lbs. CR 3094 concerns a check constraint on the IRP_WEIGHT_CARRIED field itself.

Volpe will post the CR to the listserv for comment.

[2006-06-20] Volpe posted the following modified description to the listserv on 6/19/06:
PRISM stakeholder requested to re-visit the data requirement for safety_carrier. After SAFER version 4.9, safety_carrier becomes a conditional mandatory field in T0022 transaction. This requires CVISNstates participating in PRISM to populate safety_carrier data field for all vehicle uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN only state.

The proposed modification is when the IRP_weight_Carried is under 6,000 lbs or a limit to be determined, the carrier responsible for the safety of the vehicle will not be required to have DOT number. The safety_carrier field does not need to be filled.

The new requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER will be as following:

1. Conditional mandatory for CVISN states participating in PRISM only if the IRP_weight_Carrier for the vehicle is over 6,000 lb or to be defined.
2. Optional for CVISN only states and carriers whose vehicle IRP weight carried in under 6,000 lb or to be defined

[2006-06-27] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting
Volpe will rewrite the description of this CR for clarification and repost to the listserv.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.
The Volpe SAFER team needs to discuss this with the PRISM team and then clarify the description of this CR. Volpe will repost this to the CVISN System Architects listserv for comment.

[2006-08-14] Volpe - updated SAFER CR 797 description as follows:

PRISM stakeholders were requested to re-visit the data requirement for the SAFETY_CARRIER field. After SAFER version 4.9 was released in October 2005, the SAFETY_CARRIER field became a conditional mandatory for PRISM states using the T0022 transaction. This requires CVISN states that participate in PRISM to populate the SAFETY_CARRIER field for all vehicles uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN-only states.

The proposed modification to the edit check for the SAFETY_CARRIER field is that SAFER will allow null for the SAFETY_CARRIER field only if the GVW is provided in the T0022 transaction and the value is under 10,000 lbs and greater than 4,000 lbs. Regardless of the GVW, if the vehicle has three or more axles, the DOT number is required for the SAFETY_CARRIER field. Other situations where the DOT number is required for PRISM are when vehicles of any size haul placardable quantities of HM and when Limo's are subject to Federal insurance requirements that need to be defined.

Therefore the new requirement for the SAFETY_CARRIER field should be as follows:

1. Mandatory for PRISM states and CVISN-PRISM states using the T0022 transaction.
2. Optional for CVISN-only states.
3. For CVISN-only states, "Null" is allowed as the value IF the GVW is greater than 4,000 lbs. but less than 10,000 lbs.
4. For PRISM and CVISN-PRISM states, "Null" is allowed as the value IF the GVW is greater than 4,000 lbs. but less than 10,000 lbs.
AND the vehicle has less than 3 axles
AND the vehicle does not haul placardable quantities of HM
AND the vehicle is not a limousine subject to Federal insurance requirements.

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17/06 ACCB meeting

The PRISM team noted that this CR should be consistent with the PRISM Procedures Manual. In particular, the difference between GVW (gross vehicle weight – the weight the carrier declares at registration) and GVWR (gross vehicle weight rating – the weight that the manufacturer stamps on the inside of the power unit door) was discussed. The Volpe PRISM team agreed to reconcile the PRISM Procedures Manual with CVISN by using GVW rather than GVWR. They would also like the lower limit to be 0 rather than 4000 lbs.

[2006-10-03] Discussed at the 9/21/06 ACCB meeting

Discussion about the data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER lead to a simplified description as follows: If the Gross Vehicle Weight for the vehicle is greater than 10,000 pounds, then SAFETY_CARRIER is a required field for states participating in PRISM, including CVISN/PRISM states.

[2006-10-17] Discussion about the data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER lead to a simplified description as follows:

If the Gross Vehicle Weight for the vehicle is greater than 10,000 pounds, then SAFETY_CARRIER is a required field for states participating in PRISM, including CVISN/PRISM states.

Fix:

Comment:

**Attachment
names:**

Responsibility:

Modified Time: 11/10/2006 12:38:35 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 5/15/2006 10:06:55 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 4651
External Reference: CR3013, SAFER CR 705
Category: SAFER XML, SAFER ICD
Component: SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis: Implement VIN, IRP Account and IFTA Account validation for SAFER XML Service input transaction.
Status: Open
Disposition: [2006-11-21] Open pending further discussion and review.
Description: [2006-04-19]
CR 3013 was closed at the 3/23/06 ACCB meeting. Phase 2 of that CR is moved to this CR. The following are segments from the old CR that pertain.
"VIN validation was the topic of discussion for this CR. Jingfei Wu (Volpe) pointed out that only the data formatting rules will be enforced, and the IFTA/IRP/VIN validation will be in the following release of SAFER after receiving comments from stakeholders. Some states expressed an interest in getting a warning for invalid VINs instead of rejections. Validation is done at the jurisdiction site because of home-made VINs that the state considers valid. These VINs would fail the VIN validation routine at SAFER. It was suggested that states send their VIN patterns to Volpe so SAFER can check against those as well. Phase 1 of the implementation will be to enforce the edit checks for the formatting rules listed in the specification document. After a state is recertified, the rules will be enforced for that state. Phase 2 of this CR will enforce IFTA/IRP/VIN validation."

"The VIN/IRP account / IFTA account validation checks will be implemented in Phase 2. Iteris asked if the states will have to recertify again when Phase 2 is released. Volpe said yes. States asked if Phase 2 validation rules would cause SAFER to reject the records. Volpe said that would be up to the stakeholders. If the stakeholders only want a warning and not a rejection, then recertification wouldn't be necessary."

[2006-05-04] re discussion of CR 3013 at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.
CR 3013 was closed, and the Phase 2 (VIN/IRP/IFTA) validation checks will be documented in Architecture CR 4651 (SAFER CR 705).

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.
This CR was originally part of CR 3013. Listserv comments to CR 3013 will be reviewed and this CR will be discussed at the December ACCB meeting.

[2006-12-18] Discussed at the 12/14/06 ACCB meeting.
Volpe needs more input from states on requirements.
Fix:
Comment:

Attachment names: 2005-12-19 CR3013-SAFER139_data standardization_Comments.xls
2006-01-25_CR 139 Specification.doc

Responsibility:

Modified Time: 12/18/2006 8:50:04 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 4/19/2006 10:32:38 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 3670

External Reference: SAFER CR 143, SAFER CR 302, SAFER CR 348

Category: SAFER XML

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management

Status: Open

Disposition: [2006-07-26] Open pending further discussion.

Description: [2005-06-21] SAFER CR 302
This change request is created to address Call # 79695 initiated by Cambridge Systematics.

During recent development work on the Electronic Screening transaction for Connecticut, Cambridge Systematics described a business case scenario which SAFER does not handle in the current design of SAFER.

Transaction T0023 contains a list of states that the carrier authorizes SAFER to send its vehicles' transponder IDs to. If the state sends in another T0023 with one authorized state removed, does SAFER send out information to that state to remove those transponders?

It seems to suggest that when a carrier removes an authorized jurisdiction from the T0023 transaction SAFER needs a capability to inform the state and delete the transponder information associated with all vehicles owned by the particular carrier.

[2005-06-29] Presented and discussed at the 6/23/05 ACCB meeting.

It was suggested that resending the T0023 Carrier Authorization Input Transaction (E-Screening Enrollment) with a state removed would accomplish the goal of removing an authorized jurisdiction. Alana Gourneau (SD) offered to talk to CSI for further information/clarification of this CR. CR remains open pending further discussion.

[2005-08-02] Presented and discussed at the 7/28/05 ACCB meeting
Cambridge Systems, Inc. (CSI), explained the reasoning behind the request for a delete function for the T0024 transaction.

- A T0023 transaction is sent to SAFER authorizing States A, C, and D to receive vehicle

transponder data.

- A new T0023 transaction is sent to SAFER authorizing States E, C, and D to receive vehicle transponder data.
- Delete transponder numbers from State A's vehicles since they are no longer authorized to receive the data.

Volpe will look into the requirement for SAFER to send out a T0024 with blank transponder numbers to delete the transponder numbers from State A's vehicle records. Volpe also suggested sending out a T0024 that includes the transponder numbers when a State is added to the T0023 transaction. This CR will remain open pending further SAFER analysis.

[2005-11-28] Discussed at the 11/17/05 CVISN ACCB meeting.

This CR and SAFER CR 143 (Modify the XML T0029 transaction not to include records that do not have transponder information) will be combined for further analysis and to develop a Business Use Case for e-screening enrollment and transponder ID management to enable states to see how it ties into their business processes. The Business Use Case will be presented to the ACCB for further discussion. The synopsis was changed to reflect this change.

[2006-05-04] SAFER CR 302 Presented at the 4/20/06 CVISN ACCB meeting.

Transaction T0023 contains a list of states to which a carrier authorizes SAFER to send its vehicles' transponder IDs. If a carrier wants to remove an authorized jurisdiction, the state sends in another T0023 without the jurisdiction that is no longer authorized. SAFER needs a capability to inform the no-longer-authorized state and delete the transponder information associated with all vehicles owned by the particular carrier. There was some discussion regarding a similar capability for adding an authorized vehicle. The ACCB suggested that VOLPE update the CR to explain the process in more detail. Volpe needs to modify the CR to make sure the interpretation of the request is correct and resubmit to the ACCB.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.

The ACCB agreed that this CR should be added to the list of e-screening issues and discussed further. Architecture CR 3670 asks Volpe to develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management. The E-screening Use Case could be used as a mechanism to clarify the existing e-screening process for the stakeholders. This SAFER CR was incorporated into Arch CR 3670 (Synopsis: Develop a Business Use Case for E-screening Enrollment and Transponder ID Management), which will be discussed along with other issues in the E-screening Enrollment focus group.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.

Volpe has not completed development of a Business Use Case for e-screening enrollment and transponder management, and it was requested that they participate in the E-Screening Focus Group.

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:
Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Stuart Mary W
Modified Time: 11/21/2006 2:31:25 PM
Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On: 6/21/2005 8:29:46 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Enhancement
Closed On:

CR Number: 3114
External Reference: SAFER CR 173
Category: SAFER XML
Component: SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis: Enhance T0032 transaction to include additional company information.

Summary: This transaction will be versioned to add additional company information to the L&I transaction.

Action: States are requested to comment as to whether there are additional L&I data fields they would like to see added to the T0032v2 transaction not currently seen in the T0032 transaction.

Status: Recommended

Disposition: [2006-03-21] Approved and scheduled for SAFER v5.1 release (Aug 2006)

Description: Missouri has requested that the following data elements be added to the T0032 transaction:
---Add the carrier's business street, business city, business state, and business zip to the T0032 xml file. ---Add BOC3 yes or no indicator to the T0032 XML file.
---Add Blanket Company field to the T0032 XML file.
---Dependent upon the criteria of the statuses, we might need a status effective date for the Common_Auth_Status and Contract_Auth_Status fields if the status and the dates are not timed properly.

General statements from Missouri:

Missouri is implementing a new web-based system for a one-stop shop and would like to use federal data for filing requirements for the Single State Registration Program. If we have sufficient information, we can continue to monitor federal data and use the data without additional filing requirements in our state. This would allow us to know immediately when the federal authority is inactive and can take the same action at the state level in conjunction with our credentials issued. In order to use this data, we believe that additional data elements for this program are needed as outlined below.

The T0032 file, which contains information about authority granted under the MC number, does not contain the business address. This address which is defined as the carrier's principle place of business where their headquarters are located, is needed within this file for use by states under the SSRS program because some reciprocity agreements waive fees based on principle place of

business. I know that a physical address is in the T0031 file address, and although in most instances is the same address as what would be shown in the T0032 file, it has a different definition. That address is defined as where the safety records are maintained and can be made available. In Missouri's experience, for the most part, these two addresses are the same. We have found, however, that they can be, and in some cases are, different and must be respected as different. This makes it more important that we have the right address with the right definition. States can get into trouble if we either collect or fail to collect proper fees for other jurisdictions.

Also, in looking historically at the Licensing and Insurance file, we find that the status of the carrier shows ACTIVE and the BOC3 file shows "NO" quite often. This tells us that the BOC3 requirements are not being met and the carrier is in noncompliance even though the status is ACTIVE. What would be helpful to Missouri is to have that field in the T0032 file along with the Blanket Company field. We could then police that requirement and have the carrier file it when it is not on file. If we could rely on the data to be filed when it should be, we would not need this information.

[2005-04-25] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-04-21.

This transaction will be versioned to add additional company information to the transaction (T0032v2). States will only have to make modifications to their systems if they want these fields. Volpe asked the states if there are other L&I data fields that should be included in the new transaction. This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comment and review.

[2005-05-04] Wisconsin posted the following request for additional data fields via the CVISN System Architects list serv.

From enforcement: Not sure what's there now, but we will need to have real-time access to operating authority information for ALL carriers. The FMCSA requires that we place carriers operating without authority or beyond the scope of their authority out-of-service at the roadside.
From Insurance/Authority/SSRS program: It would be nice if we had accurate information on true legal name, company officers, EIN number and when they are revoked what is the specific reason why.

[2005-05-24] Presented and discussed at the ACCB meeting on 2005-05-19.

Volpe will check on the availability of the additional fields requested by WI. The CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-05-27] Volpe's response (via list serv) to additional fields requested by WI:

After checking with the L&I team, it appears that ownership/company officers and EIN are stored in MCMIS. SAFER currently gets EIN from MCMIS via the MCMIS load program but not ownership/company officers. We need to add ownership/company officers to the company snapshot in order to get the data from MCMIS. SAFER also receives the legal name from MCMIS, not L&I, but they are the same legal name. If you could verify that this is the legal name you are asking for, that would be great.

Operating authority does not apply to "ALL carriers" but only to for-hire, which is a small subset. As far as L&I goes, they are only revoked because of insurance lapses.

[2005-06-29] Presented for informational purposes at 6/23/05 ACCB meeting.

This CR was presented for informational purposes only since it was already recommended for FMCSA approval last month. Volpe responded to WI's request for additional fields in the T0032 Licensing and Insurance Update transaction. EIN and ownership/company officers are currently stored in MCMIS. SAFER currently gets EIN from MCMIS via the MCMIS load program but not ownership/company officers. Volpe would need to add ownership/company officers to the company snapshot in order to get the data from MCMIS. Volpe suggested that since the snapshots were being changed, the additional fields should be requested from MCMIS. These fields will be incorporated in the T0031V2 MCMIS Safety and Census Update Output Transaction under CR 3115.

[2006-03-21]

This is an August release candidate for T0032 transaction.

[2006-05-04] Presented at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.

The enhancements will be incorporated in the T0032v2 transaction.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting. Volpe will discuss FY07 implementation of this capability with FMCSA. It will need coordination with L&I.

Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 10/19/2006 6:28:43 PM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 4/15/2005 9:32:35 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Suggestion
Closed On:

CR Number: 2936

External Reference: SAFER CR 348; SAFER CR 302

Category: New data element needed

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: A source, other than the authoritative source, may submit e-screening enrollment data to SAFER. States requested a data element to track the source of the transponder data.

Summary: Any state can update e-screening information (XML T0024). States do not object to an unauthorized state submitting transponder information for another state, as long as the vehicle registration data is not affected.

Proposal: Add a data element to track the source of the transponder data.

Status: Recommended

Disposition: [2006-03-21] Approved and scheduled for SAFER v5.1 release (Aug 2006)

Description: [2004-08-23] At the teleconference on 2004-08-16 to discuss CR 2798, it was noted that any state can update e-screening information (XML T0024). States did not object to an unauthorized state submitting transponder information for another state, as long as the vehicle registration data is not affected. Washington requested a data element to track the source of the transponder data. This was also mentioned at the 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-27 ACCB meeting.
CR 2936 will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments and will be voted on at the October ACCB.

[2004-10-25] Presented and discussed at the 2004-10-21 ACCB meeting.
There were no dissenting votes so the CR was recommended for FMCSA approval.

[2005-08-02]
This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval in October 2004, but a SAFER CR was not written. Volpe now has created SAFER CR 348 and will discuss it with FMCSA.

[2006-03-21]
Pending in SAFER. This is to be implemented in August release of SAFER.

[2006-05-04] Presented and discussed at the 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.
At the March 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122), which addresses management of update authority for vehicle registration data, be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1. Since Architecture CR 2936 addresses management of update authority for transponder data, states suggested that the scope of Architecture CR 2798 be expanded to include other transactions, including transponder data. Volpe pointed out that the testing requirements for implementing the CR would expand significantly. Volpe said that the implementation of Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122) will create audit tables only and will not involve sending output transactions. Volpe will re-write these CRs. APL suggested they be kept as separate CRs, but reflect this discussion about what the states really want.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.
Architecture CRs 2936 (e-screening data) and 2798 (IRP registration data) deal with Authoritative Source. Volpe will check with FMCSA to see if both can be incorporated in SAFER Release 5.1. If not, then maybe CR 2936 can be included in 5.1 and CR 2798 in Release 5.2.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.
Implementation was deferred from SAFER 5.1 but is on the list for FY07. This CR is related to Architecture CR 3670 (SAFER CR 302). E-screening issues are being addressed by the E-Screening Enrollment Focus Group, which needs to document business rules and use cases and bring that material before the ACCB.

Impact on architecture:
Change to CVIEW - SAFER XML interface at detailed level

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on states:
If the information is just captured in a SAFER table, none.

If XML transactions are versioned to accept/report this data element, then states exchanging escreening data would need to use the versioned schemas and may need to change processing.

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility:
Modified Time: 11/21/2006 10:14:19 AM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 8/23/2004 12:22:08 PM
Entered By: Salazar Sandra B
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 2798
External Reference: SAFER CR 122; DJ Waddell - MD - 240-228-5878
Category: Business rules/process to clarify data source
Component: SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis: Synopsis: Data integrity issues are resulting from a source other than the authoritative source submitting vehicle registration data to SAFER.

Summary: A source other than the authoritative source can submit vehicle registration data to SAFER. If the authoritative source later updates the information, the data already in SAFER may be overwritten. Business rules/process need to be established (a) to clarify the source of data and (b) to coordinate data entry/update by authoritative source and authorized but not 'authoritative' source.

Proposal: The proposal consists of several clauses.

1. A state (in most cases, a "non-participating" state) may authorize another state to send vehicle registration data to SAFER on its behalf; this must be documented by letter/email. Letter/email will also be required to withdraw the authorization.
2. A new table in SAFER will be created to keep track of which states are authorized to send vehicle registration data to SAFER for any given state. The default would be that only the IRP base state would be authorized to send vehicle registration data to SAFER.
3. Volpe will consider whether the new table is also the appropriate place to store contact information.
4. If a state that is not authorized according to the process attempts to send vehicle registration data (XML T0020, T0021, or T0022) for another state to SAFER, the XML transactions will be rejected and the IRP base state will be notified that an unauthorized state has attempted to send vehicle registration data on its behalf.
5. The REGISTRATION_START_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE will be a mandatory field in the vehicle registration data.
6. The table will be posted in some form on the CVISN website.

Status: Recommended

Disposition: [2006-05-26] Recommended for SAFER Release 5.1 or 5.2.

Description: A source other than the authoritative source, such as an e-screening enrollment system, can submit vehicle registration data to SAFER. If the authoritative source (e.g. IRP base state) later updates the information, the data already in SAFER, such as the e-screening enrollment information, may be overwritten. Business rules or a process need to be established (a) to clarify the source of data and (b) to coordinate data entry/update by authoritative source and authorized but not 'authoritative' source.

[2004-07-12] per DJ Waddell 7/8/04

Scenario: Vehicle operators want to enroll in Maryland's e-screening program, but their IRP base state has not provided registration data for the vehicle to SAFER.

Maryland's e-screening enrollment system collects data from the registrant, creates a vehicle registration record in CVIEW, and then enrolls the specified carrier and vehicle for the Maryland e-screening program. Data details are below. Maryland's e-screening enrollment program is operated by state agencies under the Maryland DOT, as is Maryland's IRP office.

Once the registration data is entered, the e-screening enrollment process may proceed, collecting the transponder number and the jurisdictions to enroll for. Technically, transponder number is part of the Vehicle_VIN table, so it is registration data.

The registration data is sent to SAFER by MD CVIEW.

Analysis is needed on potential data collisions. If an authoritative source for vehicle registration data begins to contribute data to SAFER, and provides an update to one of the registration records entered by another source, the new data will probably overwrite the data already in SAFER. For example, if the IRP base state updates registration data entered by the MD e-screening program, this would probably un-enroll the vehicle from MD E-Screening, since transponder number and CVIS_DEFAULT_CARRIER USDOT number would probably not be provided by the IRP base state, and they would probably be replaced by NULL.

A process is needed to "close the loop" with non-participating states to inform them of data submitted listing them as the IRP Base State, and to request new expiration dates when license plates are renewed for enrolled vehicles. For example, MD would like to have in place ASAP an email list for the IRP offices for each jurisdiction. Then when a vehicle registration record is created or modified for e-screening enrollment, an email would be sent (possibly/someday automatically) to the corresponding jurisdiction's designated IRP office. MD proposes that the change go into CVIEW and SAFER with no action from the base jurisdiction, as it does now, with a plan/process in place so that it could be retracted if the base jurisdiction objects, with any eye to automating that process as well.

Vehicle Registration Data Fields:

Mandatory Fields:

VIN

License plate number

License plate state (= IRP base state)

Registration expiration date

IRP registered weight for the e-screening state

USDOT number of the carrier responsible for the safe operation of the vehicle

Transponder identifier

Optional Fields:

Title number

Title jurisdiction

Owner name
Unit number
Model year
Make
Type
Fuel type
GVW
Unladen weight
Number of axles (truck)
Number of seats (bus)
Registration start date

[2004-07-19] Presented and discussed at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting.

This CR will be posted to the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for discussion; no decision is being proposed at this time. A conference call will be scheduled for the week of August 16 if states are interested.

[2004-08-11] Andrew Wilson posted a document and a spreadsheet to the CVISN System Architect list serv. Both are available via the Attachments tab.

1. The attached Word document contains some background notes for the upcoming conference regarding CVISN Architecture CR 2798.
2. The attached spreadsheet contains the number of IRP records by IRP base state currently in the SAFER database. The relatively small number of records for some states are typically records that were entered to support E-Screening enrollment or PRISM vehicle targeting for another State.

[2004-08-23] This CR was discussed at the July and August ACCB meetings, and at a special teleconference on August 16, 2004. The proposal described in the "Synopsis" section was developed and refined at those meetings. Corrected minutes from the 2004-08-16 meeting are attached to this CR.

[2004-09-08] There is a correction to the minutes of the 19 Aug ACCB meeting. Item 3-5 should read: "5. The REGISTRATION_START_DATE and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE will be mandatory fields in the vehicle registration data."

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-23 ACCB meeting.

Item 3-5 was modified to read: "The REGISTRATION_START_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE will be a conditionally mandatory field in the vehicle registration data."

This CR was recommended for FMCSA approval. It will also be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for review.

[2006-03-30] Presented at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

Currently, State A can submit registration data for State B, and SAFER would not reject the transaction. A proposal was developed by a subcommittee of the ACCB and later approved and recommended for FMCSA approval in September 2004. SAFER CR 122 is pending and Volpe said that it was not a current candidate for the SAFER 5.1 release in August. States on the call felt strongly that the issue of management of update authority should be resolved as soon as possible and that the CR should be considered a high priority for the 5.1 release.

[2006-05-04] re discussion of CR 2936 at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.

At the March 2006 ACCB meeting, states requested that Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122), which addresses management of update authority for vehicle registration data, be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1. Since Architecture CR 2936 addresses management of update authority for transponder data, states suggested that the scope of Architecture CR 2798 be expanded to include other transactions, including transponder data. Volpe pointed out that the testing requirements for implementing the CR would expand significantly. Volpe said that the implementation of

Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122) will create audit tables only and will not involve sending output transactions. Volpe will re-write these CRs. APL suggested they be kept as separate CRs, but reflect this discussion about what the states really want.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

Architecture CRs 2936 (e-screening data) and 2798 (IRP registration data) deal with Authoritative Source. Volpe will check with FMCSA to see if both can be incorporated in SAFER Release 5.1. If not, then maybe CR 2936 can be included in 5.1 and CR 2798 in Release 5.2.

[2006-10-19] Status reported at the 10/19/06 ACCB meeting.

Item 5 in the proposal of the CR was corrected to "The REGISTRATION_START_DATE will be a mandatory field and REGISTRATION_EXPIRE_DATE will be a mandatory field in the vehicle registration data." Volpe will discuss FY07 implementation of this capability with FMCSA.

Impact on architecture:
None

Impact on documentation:
SAFER ICD

Impact on States:
States will need to implement the process described in the proposal.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR2798 analysis_V02.doc
CR2798 IRPCounts.xls
ACCB CR 2798 Minutes 2004-08-16_v2.doc
Minutes of CVISN ACCB Meeting August 19 2004 - Correction to CR 2798.rtf

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 10/19/2006 6:26:28 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 7/12/2004 8:59:22 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 2562

External Reference: SAFER CR # 50

Category: XML, EDI, ICD

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: Request to review SAFER business rule regarding multiple VINs

Status: Recommended
Disposition: [2007-01-18] Recommended for FMCSA Approval.
Description: Submitted on Dec 16th, 2003
Nebraska is requesting that the following SAFER business rule be reviewed.

The second business rule we would like reviewed is the requirement that the SAFER extract file does not allow more than one VIN entry within the same jurisdiction. It is my understanding that the file may contain duplicate VIN entries across jurisdictions but not within a jurisdiction. The same scenario that would create the situation where a vehicle appears in two jurisdictions could also happen, and does with some regularity, within a jurisdiction.

Vehicle A is registered under Carrier ABC Co. at the beginning of the registration year. Six months into the registration year, Vehicle A breaks lease with carrier ABC Co. and leases onto Carrier XYZ, Co. Carrier ABC Co. waits several weeks to file the appropriate paper work to transfer registration fees from Vehicle A to newly added vehicle B. During the interim, vehicle A is technically active in both carrier ABC Co. and XYZ Co. Carrier ABC Co. paid registration fees for vehicle A and until such time that they direct the Department to either refund or transfer those fees, the vehicle remains active in their fleet. Carrier XYZ Co. has also paid registration fees for the same vehicle, so the vehicle is also active (albeit with a different plate number) in that fleet. I understand that from an enforcement perspective this may seem confusing, but today, if a check by VIN, were conducted on the Nebraska system under the example above, both vehicles would appear active until specific carrier initiated action would require us to inactivate one.

[2004-03-11] Discussed at 2004-01-15 ACCB meeting.
It was recommended that states not send a vehicle registration to SAFER when it is in a transitional state.

It is recommended that Volpe review this business rule as documented in the SAFER v4.2 ICD and as implemented in SAFER.

[2004-08-23] Discussed at 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.
This CR, related to the problem of multiple VINs, was submitted by Nebraska in December, 2003. Nebraska has developed a workaround (handling the situation via edit, so that duplicate records are not sent to SAFER). This CR will be closed. However, Volpe will consider this issue as it relates to PRISM and potential future merging of data requirements and business rules of the CVISN and PRISM programs.

[2005-02-08] Discussed at 2005-01-20 ACCB meeting (as Volpe CR 50)
Volpe updates 2005-02-03 to CR 50:
"At the request of the stakeholder, this CR is reopened since CR 50 was created primarily for a transitional data issue. There are other business scenarios where non-transitional data in the state IRP system need to be uploaded to SAFER but are currently rejected by SAFER due to the business rule violation. The data sent by the states may contain both active and inactive records for the same vehicle as states desire to have inactive statuses sent to SAFER in order to ensure that the most accurate data are kept there and sent to other jurisdictions. This would require SAFER to modify the business logic to allow one vehicle to have more than one record accepted during data input processing. Additionally, states may have business practices where multiple license plates need to exist for one vehicle within the jurisdiction and this is not allowed by the existing SAFER business rule.

The current SAFER system implements the following business rules for vehicle registration transaction:

RULE 1: A VIN can only have one PLATE/STATE within a state at any given time.

RULE 2: A PLATE/STATE can only be assigned to one VIN within a state at any given time

Since modification of the business rules has great impact on the data exchanged between CVISN

and SAFER, and potentially between CVISN/PRISM and SAFER, Volpe would like to re-evaluate the validity of the current business rules whether or not they support the current business practices and the future business requirements. Volpe would also like to solicit comments and feedback from the states whether there is sufficient interest in implementing the changes."
End Volpe 2005-02-03 updates.-----

[2005-03-01] Presented and discussed at the 2/17/05 ACCB meeting.

Comments from several states generally supported the idea that the proposed change would reflect business practices in their states. On the other hand, there were several states that currently follow the same business rules that SAFER has in place and opposed the idea. It was inconclusive at this point whether it was necessary or desirable (or neither) to modify the SAFER rules. Discussion was deferred until the March ACCB meeting. More input is needed from States.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.

The CVISN/PRISM subcommittee of the ACCB recommends that this CR be approved to allow more than one registration record per VIN within the same jurisdiction. Recent changes to the SAFER database structure would accommodate this change. Volpe also noted that there should be a CR written to implement a capability for a state to select to receive the most recent record or all records via the subscription process. This would support SAFER CRs 50 and 1386.

[2007-01-18] Recommended for FMCSA Approval.

IMPACT on architecture:

No impact on documentation (other than SAFER ICD)

Fix:
Comment:
Attachment names:
Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time: 1/18/2007 4:15:19 PM
Modified By: Salazar Sandra B
Entered On: 3/23/2004 10:13:12 AM
Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C
Severity: Medium
Priority: No
Type: Defect
Closed On:

CR Number: 733

External Reference: Tania Rossouw, WI - VOLPE CR 16

Category: Need for permit snapshots

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: States requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

Summary: This CR was originally proposed by WI in September, 2002. In order to share permit data through SAFER, states need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short

term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate?

Status: Open

Disposition: [2006-08-21] Open pending stakeholder comment.

Description: At the Sept. 19, 2002 ACCB meeting, Tania Rossouw of Wisconsin requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

[2002-10-18 ncm] Presented and discussed at ACCB meeting 10/17/02. States agreed that the capability for SAFER to handle permit data is needed. This feature will not be included in SAFER 4.2, but will be added to the list for future SAFER updates.

[2005-09-19 per sbs]

CR 733 Falls under the Expanded CVISN "better e-credentialing." Remains open pending further analysis.

[2006-03-29] Presented again at the 2006-03-23 ACCB meeting.

This CR was originally proposed by WI in September, 2002. In order to share permit data through SAFER, we need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate? NE issues short-term permits and views this as an intrastate concern. However, NV strongly supports the concept of permit transactions, as they issue annual permits and reciprocal permits with other states. Volpe was asked to report on what HazMat Safety Permit data fields are being sent to SAFER.

[2006-04-19] Fields being sent to SAFER in attachment.

[2006-04-25] This CR will be posted to the listserv for a 30-day comment period.

Stakeholder action:

1. Review the attached document for Permit data already being sent to SAFER via MCMIS.
2. In order to share permit data through SAFER, states need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate?

Respond to the listserv by 2005-05-17 with your answers to the questions above.

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

WA asked for more time to comment on this CR. APL will repost to the CVISN System Architects' listserv.

[2006-06-27] Discussed at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting.

The ACCB agreed that this CR requires more participation from the stakeholders and additional research by Volpe/FMCSA. The CR will be reposted.

[2006-07-26] Discussed at the 7/20/06 ACCB meeting.

Additional stakeholder input will be supplied to the CVISN System Architects listserv next week by Terri Ungerman. SD suggested getting onto their www.SDTruckinfo.com site to see the types of permits available for their state.

[2006-08-07] Terri Ungerman, Oklahoma CVISN System Architect posted the following to the listserv:

SAFER fields - Recommendations
as of August 4, 2006

Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures

Participating States
Illinois IL

Michigan MI
Minnesot MN
Nevada NV
Ohio OH
Oklahoma OK
West Virginia WV

Credential Unique Identifier - AAA-NNNNNNNN-AA

AAA =

UPM = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste, in all states but OH and MN.

UPW = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste in OH and MN & for NV Radioactive Waste after Part III Review

UPR = Intrastate Carrier only (without reciprocity into other states)

NNNNNNNN = 8 digit USDOT #

AA = Two digit Issuing State

Credential Expiration Date (Not Applicable for P status)

MM-DD-YYYY

Credential Status

P = Pending

A = Active

E = Expired

L = Letter of Filing (Temporary Credential)

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17 ACCB meeting

Data element requirements for HazMat permits from the Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures, which includes 7 states, were posted to the listserv. Terri Ungerman also noted that since there will be other types of permits besides HazMat, a Permit Type data element should be added. Perhaps there should also be a way to indicate for which states a particular permit type is applicable. SD has identified about 30 different types of permits (www.SDTruckinfo.com). The CR will remain open during this requirements gathering phase. Volpe will define each proposed data element. States are asked to continue to provide comments via the listserv.

[2006-11-21] Discussed at the 11/16/06 ACCB meeting.

Several months ago, Terri Ungerman collected data requirements for hazmat permit snapshots. Some states have expressed an interest in OS/OW and other types of regional permit snapshots. Other states have said they are not interested in any type of permit snapshots for e-screening. It was suggested that this CR needs a State champion to develop the requirements.

[2006-11-27] Attachment from SD added.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment Hazmat Safety Permit Number.doc

names: CR0733_Data Elements for Permits.doc

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 11/27/2006 7:01:13 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 9/18/2002 8:34:57 AM

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion
Closed On:

Total: 15